

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,281	03/15/2001	John M. Hall	10004375-1	8897

7590 07/16/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/810,281	Applicant(s) HALL ET AL.	
	Examiner Benjamin R Bruckart	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-15-01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20041126, 20010315.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Detailed Action***

Claims 1-21 are pending in this Office Action.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements filed on papers 2 and 3 have been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said second client" in claim 1, line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claim 1-6, 14-15, 18-19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al.**

Regarding claim 1, a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network environment (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28), the method comprising:

- associating a plurality of user-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);
- receiving a first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);
- receiving user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);
- identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and
- determining a first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the network includes a directory server, and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2, wherein the directory server is an LDAP server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification information is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 55).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification information is a user name (Agraharam: col. 5, lines 24-37; col. 3, lines 56-69; telephone number is like a username).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66).

Regarding claim 14, a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28) comprising:

- associating a plurality of user-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);
- receiving a first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);
- receiving user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);
- identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and
- determining a first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

Regarding claim 15, the medium of claim 14, wherein the network includes a directory server, and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 18, a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28), the method comprising:

- receiving a communication including destination information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56) and sender identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59), the destination information including a first sender-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);
- determining whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Agraharam also teaches 3, lines 51-66);
- accessing a sender record based on the received sender identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; accessing the database records comparing the telephone with the registered accts);
- providing action information identifying a plurality of actions associated with a plurality of sender-relative destinations (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);

identifying a first action in the action information based on the received destination information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 51-66), the first action associated with the first sender-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66);

identifying a first attribute in the sender record based on the first action and the received destination information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 3, lines 51-66; matching the address and the telephone number);

determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66).

Regarding claim 19, the method of claim 18, wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the sender record is accessed from the directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; col. 3, lines 59-66).

Regarding claim 21, the method of claim 18, and further comprising:

accessing a plurality of employee records based on the first action (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; looking up the translation data);

comparing a first attribute in each employee record with the first attribute in the sender record (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 51-66; compare the telephone number with the translated address);

identifying employee records with a first attribute that matches the first attribute of the sender's record (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66; col. 4, lines 1-12);

determining a plurality of absolute destinations based on the identified employee records (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66; col. 4, lines 1-12).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 7-10, 16, 17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 by Takahashi.**

**Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,587,540 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 by McDowell et al.**

Regarding claim 7,

The Agraharam reference teaches the method of claim 1, of relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state forwarding to more than one email address.

The Takahashi reference teaches the destination is a plurality of email addresses (Takahashi: col. 7, lines 2-10; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while forwarding to more than one email address as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Takahashi et al.



Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 9, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a plurality of fax phone numbers (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 1, and further comprising providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of user-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 16,

The Agraharam reference teaches the medium of claim 14, relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state forwarding to a fax number.

The Takahashi reference teaches wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while forwarding to a fax number as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 17, the medium of claim 14, wherein the method further comprises providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of user-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 11,

The Weik reference teaches a network device configured to be coupled to a computer network (Weik: Figure 1, tag 10), the network device comprising:

a receiver for receiving a communication (Weik: col. 1, lines 34-42; Figure 1, tag 1), the communication including destination information and sender identification information (Weik: col. 1, lines 36-52; col. 2, lines 37-43);

search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 20-25; lines 37-44); and

a controller coupled to the receiver, the controller configured to: identify whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-44); perform at least one search of the directory server based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61); and identify at least one absolute destination based on the search (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66).

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.

The McDowell reference teaches LDAP with a directory server (McDowell: col. 6, lines 12-18; Figure 12) and memory (McDowell: col. 16, lines 8-20) to find an absolute destination for the email to be forwarded to (McDowell: col. 3, lines 38-64).

The McDowell reference further teaches the invention overcomes lost email because of defunct email addresses by eliminating bouncing of inaccurately addressed emails with the forward file (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the network device for searching sender information from a communication as taught by Weik while utilizing a directory server to forward the message as taught by McDowell in order to reduce lost and bounced email (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Weik and McDowell et al.

Regarding claim 12, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores a mapping table that includes the search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61).

Regarding claim 13, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores an address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61), and wherein the controller is configured to identify the at least one absolute destination based on information in the stored mapping table and in the stored address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66).

Regarding claim 20,

The Agraharam reference teaches the method of claim 18, for user-relative addressing.

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state a mapping table.

The Takahashi reference teaches a mapping table that associates the plurality of actions with the plurality of sender-relative destinations (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while using a mapping table as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

***Prior Art***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,905,777 issued to Foladare et al also teaches email forwarding and dissemination to a plurality of numbers, faxes, email address.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2155  
brb  
July 1, 2004

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER